JS 44 (Rev. 06/17)

CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.)

I (a) DI AINTIEEC								
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS				DEFENDANTS				
RUSSELL TROYER				DEFENDER ASSOCIATION OF PHILADELPHIA				
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff Philadelphia (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)				County of Residence of First Listed Defendant Philadelphia (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY) NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED.				
(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, Address Brian C. Farrell, Esq. Console Mattiacci Law 1525 Locust St., 9th Fl., Phila	•			Attorneys (If Known)				
II. BASIS OF JURISDICTI	ON (Place an "X" in Oi	ne Box Only)			RINCIPAL PARTIES	(Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff		
☐ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	3 Federal Question (U.S. Government N	lot a Party)		(For Diversity Cases Only) PT en of This State				
☐ 2 U.S. Government ☐ 4 Defendant	4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenshi)	p of Parties in Item III)	Citize	en of Another State	2			
				en or Subject of a reign Country	3	□ 6 □ 6		
IV. NATURE OF SUIT (Place	ce an "X" in One Box On	ly)			Click here for: Nature	of Suit Code Descriptions.		
CONTRACT		RTS	FC	DRFEITURE/PENALTY	BANKRUPTCY	OTHER STATUTES		
□ 110 Insurance PI □ 120 Marine □ 31 □ 130 Miller Act □ 31 □ 140 Negotiable Instrument □ 31 □ 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment □ 32 □ 151 Medicare Act □ 33 □ 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans □ 34 □ 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits □ 35 □ 160 Stockholders' Suits □ 35 □ 195 Contract Product Liability □ 36 □ 196 Franchise □ 36 □ REAL PROPERTY □ 36 □ 210 Land Condemnation □ 44 □ 220 Foreclosure □ 44 □ 240 Torts to Land □ 44 □ 245 Tort Product Liability □ 44 □ 290 All Other Real Property □ 44	ERSONAL INJURY 10 Airplane 15 Airplane Product Liability 20 Assault, Libel & Slander 30 Federal Employers' Liability 40 Marine 45 Marine Product Liability 50 Motor Vehicle 55 Motor Vehicle 55 Motor Vehicle Product Liability 50 Other Personal Injury Medical Malpractice CIVIL RIGHTS 40 Other Civil Rights 41 Voting 42 Employment 43 Housing/ Accommodations 45 Amer. w/Disabilities - Employment 46 Amer. w/Disabilities - Other 48 Education	PERSONAL INJURY Product Liability Product Liability Product Liability Pharmaceutical Personal Injury Product Liability Product Liability Product Liability PERSONAL PROPER 370 Other Fraud 371 Truth in Lending Truth in Lending Property Damage Product Liability PERSONAL PROPER 385 Property Damage Product Liability PRISONER PETITION Habeas Corpus: 463 Alien Detainee 510 Motions to Vacate Sentence 530 General 5315 Death Penalty Other: 540 Mandamus & Othe 550 Civil Rights 555 Prison Condition 560 Civil Detainee - Conditions of	TY	5 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 0 Other LABOR 0 Fair Labor Standards Act 0 Labor/Management Relations 0 Railway Labor Act 1 Family and Medical Leave Act 0 Other Labor Litigation 1 Employee Retirement Income Security Act IMMIGRATION 2 Naturalization Application 5 Other Immigration Actions	□ 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 □ 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157 PROP TY RIGHTS □ 820 Copyrights □ 830 Patent □ 835 Patent - Abbreviated New Drug Application □ 840 Trademark SOCIAL SECURITY □ 861 HIA (1395ff) □ 862 Black Lung (923) □ 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g)) □ 864 SSID Title XVI □ 865 RSI (405(g)) FEDERAL TAX SUITS □ 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant) □ 871 IRS—Third Party 26 USC 7609	□ 375 False Claims Act □ 376 Qui Tam (31 USC 3729(a)) □ 400 State Reapportionment □ 410 Antitrust □ 430 Banks and Banking □ 450 Commerce □ 460 Deportation □ 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations □ 480 Consumer Credit □ 490 Cable/Sat TV □ 850 Securities/Commodities/ Exchange □ 890 Other Statutory Actions □ 891 Agricultural Acts □ 893 Environmental Matters □ 895 Freedom of Information Act □ 896 Arbitration □ 899 Administrative Procedure Act/Review or Appeal of Agency Decision □ 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes		
V. ORIGIN (Place an "X" in One Box Only) I Original Proceeding 2 Removed from Proceeding 3 Remanded from Appellate Court 4 Reinstated or Reopened 5 Transferred from Another District (specify) 5 Transferred from Another District (specify) 6 Multidistrict Litigation - Transfer 8 Multidistrict Litigation - Direct File 7 Transfer 7 Trans								
VII. CAUSE OF ACTION VIII. REQUESTED IN	Plaintiff was discr CHECK IF THIS	IS A CLASS ACTION) D		•	•		
VI. CAUSE OF ACTION VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	Plaintiff was discr	IS A CLASS ACTION) D	EMAND \$ in excess of \$75,00	•	•		
VII. CAUSE OF ACTION VIII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT: VIII. RELATED CASE(S) IF ANY	Plaintiff was discr CHECK IF THIS	IS A CLASS ACTION 3, F.R.Cv.P. JUDGE	i D	n excess of \$75,00	•	•		
VII. CAUSE OF ACTION VIII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT: VIII. RELATED CASE(S) IF ANY DATE	Plaintiff was discr CHECK IF THIS UNDER RULE 2	IS A CLASS ACTION 3, F.R.Cv.P.	i D	n excess of \$75,00	00 JURY DEMAND	•		
VII. CAUSE OF ACTION VIII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT: VIII. RELATED CASE(S) IF ANY	Plaintiff was discr CHECK IF THIS UNDER RULE 2	IS A CLASS ACTION 3, F.R.Cv.P. JUDGE	i D	n excess of \$75,00	00 JURY DEMAND	•		

Case 2:17-cv-05825-CMR Document 1 Filed 12/29/17 Page 2 of 20 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA — DESIGNATION FORM to be used by counsel to indicate the category of the case for the purpose of assignment to appropriate calendar.

Address of Plaintiff: Philadelphia, PA 19130	IRANA PRO II		
Address of Defendant: 1441 Sansom Street; Phi	ladelphia, PA 19102		
Place of Accident, Incident or Transaction: Phila	delphia, PA (Use Reverse Side For Add	litional Space)	
Does this civil action involve a nongovernmental corporate			= 100/
(Attach two copies of the Disclosure Statement Form in a		Yes	
Does this case involve multidistrict litigation possibilities?		Yes□	NolX
RELATED CASE, IF ANY:			
Case Number: Judge	***************************************	Date Terminated:	
Civil cases are deemed related when yes is answered to any	of the following questions:		
1. Is this case related to property included in an earlier num	nbered suit pending or within one year	previously terminated action in this	court?
		Yes□	NoX
2. Does this case involve the same issue of fact or grow out action in this court?	of the same transaction as a prior suit	t pending or within one year previous	sly terminated
		Yes□	No⊠
3. Does this case involve the validity or infringement of a p	eatent already in suit or any earlier nur		
terminated action in this court?		Yes□	No⊠
4. Is this case a second or successive habeas corpus, social	security appeal, or pro-se civil rights of	case filed by the same individual?	
	appear, or pro se error against	Yes 🗆	No ⊠
CIVIL: (Place / in one category only)			
A. Federal Question Cases:		B. Diversity Jurisdiction Case	
1. □ Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and	l All Other Contracts	1. □ Insurance Contract a	and Other Contracts
2. □ FELA		2. Airplane Personal In	ıjury
3. □ Jones Act-Personal Injury		3. □ Assault, Defamation	l
4. □ Antitrust		4. Marine Personal Inj	ury
5. □ Patent		5. Motor Vehicle Person	onal Injury
6. □ Labor-Management Relations		6. D Other Personal Injur	y (Please specify)
7. 💢 Civil Rights		7. □ Products Liability	
8. □ Habeas Corpus		8. Products Liability —	- Asbestos
9. □ Securities Act(s) Cases		9. All other Diversity (Cases
10. □ Social Security Review Cases		(Please specify)	
11. □ All other Federal Question Cases (Please specify)			
	ARBITRATION CERTIF (Check Appropriate Cate,		
	, counsel of record do hereby certify:		
▼ Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 53.2, Section 3(c)(2), the \$150,000.00 exclusive of interest and costs;	at to the best of my knowledge and bel	ner, the damages recoverable in this c	civil action case exceed the sum of
Relief other than monetary damages is sought.	. /		
DAME 12/20/17	118	31914	E
DATE: 12/29/17	torney-at-Law		orney I.D.#
	ovo will be a trial by jury only if there		•
I certify that, to my knowledge, the within case is not rel	ated to any case now nonding or wife	thin one year proviously forming to	d action in this sourt
except as noted above.	area to any case now penuing or wi	mm one year previously terminate	a action in this court
(1/2)	/ Jan	0404	A 5"
DATE: 12/29/17	torney-at-Law	3191 ₄	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
At	winej ur wun	Attor	ney I.D.#

CIV. 609 (5/2012)

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

CASE MANAGEMENT TRACK DESIGNATION FORM

Russell Hoyel,	Plaintiff	:	CIVIL ACTION		
Note the Defender Association of	7. f Philadelphia, Defendant	:	NO.		
plaintiff shall complete filing the complaint and side of this form.) In designation, that defen	a Case Management I serve a copy on all d the event that a defi dant shall, with its find er parties, a Case Ma	Track Desi efendants. (endant does stappearandant Tragement T	y Reduction Plan of this court, counse gnation Form in all civil cases at the time See § 1:03 of the plan set forth on the revenot agree with the plaintiff regarding ce, submit to the clerk of court and serverack Designation Form specifying the tigned.	ne of verse said ve on	
SELECT ONE OF TH	IE FOLLOWING C	CASE MAN	AGEMENT TRACKS:		
(a) Habeas Corpus – C	ases brought under 2	8 U.S.C. § 2	2241 through § 2255.	()	
(b) Social Security – Cases requesting review of a decision of the Secretary of Health and Human Services denying plaintiff Social Security Benefits.					
(c) Arbitration – Cases required to be designated for arbitration under Local Civil Rule 53.2.					
(d) Asbestos – Cases in exposure to asbesto		ersonal inju	ry or property damage from	()	
commonly referred	to as complex and the erse side of this form	nat need spe	acks (a) through (d) that are cial or intense management by ed explanation of special	()	
(f) Standard Managem	ent – Cases that do n	ot fall into a	any one of the other tracks.	(X)	
12/29/17	Be	8	Plaintiff, Russell Troyer		
Date	Attorney-	at-law	Attorney for		
215-545-7676	215-565-28	51	farrell@consolelaw.com		
Telephone	FAX Nui	nber	E-Mail Address		

(Civ. 660) 10/02

Russell Troyer,

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

RUSSELL TROYER

Philadelphia, PA 19130

CIVIL ACTION NO.

Plaintiff,

٧.

DEFENDER ASSOCIATION OF PHILADELPHIA 1441 Sansom Street Philadelphia, PA 19102

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

Defendant.

COMPLAINT

I. <u>INTRODUCTION</u>

Plaintiff, Russell Troyer ("Plaintiff"), brings this action against his former employer, Defender Association of Philadelphia ("Defendant"). Plaintiff was terminated at age sixty-six (66) and after twenty (20) years of excellent performance and then replaced by an employee over twenty years (20) younger than he was. Defendant discriminated against Plaintiff because of his age in violation of the Age Discrimination in Employment Act, 29 U.S.C. §621, et seq. ("ADEA"), the Pennsylvania Human Relations Act, as amended, 43 P.S. §951, et seq. ("PHRA"), and the Philadelphia Fair Practices Ordinance, Phila. Code §9-1101, et seq. ("PFPO"). Plaintiff seeks relief, as set forth below, including his attorneys' fees and costs.

II. PARTIES

1. Plaintiff Russell Troyer ("Plaintiff") is an individual and a citizen of the

Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

- 2. Plaintiff was sixty-six (66) years of age at the time of his termination.
- 3. Defendant is an independent, non-profit corporation that is incorporated in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and is located at 1441 Sansom Street, Philadelphia, PA 19102.
- 4. Defendant is engaged in an industry affecting interstate commerce and regularly does business in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and in Philadelphia County.
- 5. At all times material hereto, Defendant employed more than twenty (20) employees.
- 6. At all times material hereto, Defendant acted by and through its authorized agents, servants, workmen, and/or employees acting within the course and scope of their employment with Defendant and in furtherance of Defendant's business.
- 7. At all times material hereto, Defendant acted as an employer within the meaning of the statutes which form the basis of this matter.
- 8. At all times material hereto, Plaintiff was an employee of Defendant within the meaning of the statutes which form the basis of this matter.

III. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 9. The causes of action which form the basis of this matter arise under the ADEA, the PHRA, and the PFPO.
- 10. The District Court has jurisdiction over Count I (ADEA) pursuant to 29 U.S.C. §626(c) and 28 U.S.C. §1331.
 - 11. The District Court has jurisdiction over Count II (PHRA) pursuant to 28

U.S.C. §1367.

- 12. The District Court has jurisdiction over Count III (PFPO) pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1367.
 - 13. Venue is proper in the District Court under 28 U.S.C. §1391(b).
- 14. On or about September 26, 2016, Plaintiff filed a Charge of Discrimination with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission ("EEOC"), complaining of acts of discrimination alleged herein. This Charge was cross-filed with the Pennsylvania Human Relations Commission ("PHRC") and the Philadelphia Commission on Human Relations ("PCHR"). Attached hereto, incorporated herein and marked as Exhibit "1" is a true and correct copy of the EEOC Charge of Discrimination (with personal identifying information redacted).
- 15. On or about October 2, 2017, the EEOC issued to Plaintiff a Dismissal and Notice of Rights. Attached hereto, incorporated herein and marked as Exhibit "2" is a true and correct copy of that notice (with personal identifying information redacted).
- 16. Plaintiff has fully complied with all administrative prerequisites for the commencement of this action.

IV. FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

- 17. Plaintiff was employed by Defendant from on or about April 1, 1996 until on or about April 11, 2016, the date of his unlawful termination.
- 18. Throughout the course of his over twenty (20) years of employment with Defendant, Plaintiff held the position of Director of Information Services. In this role, Plaintiff was responsible for, *inter alia*, overseeing the operations of Defendant's Information Technology Department ("IT Department").

- 19. Plaintiff reported to Ellen Greenlee ("Greenlee"), Chief Defender, until in or about March 2015, when Greenlee retired.
- 20. From in or about September 2015 and until his termination, Plaintiff reported to Keir Bradford-Grey ("Bradford-Grey"), who replaced Greenlee as Defendant's Chief Defender. Bradford-Grey is substantially younger than Plaintiff.
- 21. Throughout his twenty-year (20) tenure with Defendant, Plaintiff was a loyal, dedicated, and hard-working employee who consistently demonstrated excellent performance.
- 22. Prior to Bradford-Grey becoming Plaintiff's direct supervisor, Plaintiff consistently received positive feedback related to his performance.
- 23. Upon Bradford-Grey becoming Plaintiff's direct supervisor, Defendant began subjecting Plaintiff to hostile treatment, to which it did not subject Bradford-Grey's younger direct reports, to Plaintiff's knowledge. This conduct included, but was not limited to, the following:
 - a) Bradford-Grey frequently making vague comments that there were "problems" with the IT Department without providing Plaintiff any substantive details in support thereof;
 - b) Bradford-Grey repeatedly ignoring requests and suggestions from Plaintiff
 that she and Plaintiff discuss in detail the status of Defendant's IT
 operations;
 - c) Bradford-Grey rarely making any effort to engage Plaintiff in conversation;
 - d) Bradford-Grey rarely answering questions Plaintiff directed to her which required a response;

- e) Bradford-Grey failing to respond to to work-related emails Plaintiff addressed and sent directly to Bradford-Grey; and
- f) Bradford-Grey failing to meet with Plaintiff on a one-on-one basis to discuss the IT Department.
- 24. In or about the week prior to Bradford-Grey officially becoming Chief Defender for Defendant in September 2015, Plaintiff provided Bradford-Grey with a detailed report regarding the status and positive progression of Defendant's IT landscape. Through this report, Plaintiff intended to catalyze a wide-ranging, in depth series of discussions regarding Defendant's IT status, strategy, challenges, and policy.
- 25. After giving her the IT report, Bradford-Grey never discussed the report with Plaintiff absent a passing comment to Plaintiff approximately one (1) month later that she had finally read the report and "starred" many things in it that she liked.
- 26. In or about late October of 2015, Bradford-Grey abruptly informed Plaintiff that she had retained a "consultant" to review the IT Department. Bradford-Grey did not provide Plaintiff any information regarding the same, or any detailed reason why Defendant was doing so.
- 27. In or about February 2016, during a meeting with the IT Department, Bradford-Grey told Plaintiff that the IT Department operation was functioning like it was "back in 2001." Bradford-Grey provided Plaintiff no detailed justification for this vague allegation during the meeting.
 - 28. On or about April 11, 2016, Defendant terminated Plaintiff's employment.
- 29. Defendant's stated reason for terminating Plaintiff was that a "change in leadership" was necessary

- 30. Plaintiff was given no advance warning or notice that Defendant was going to terminate his employment after over twenty (20) years of service.
- 31. Defendant initially replaced Plaintiff with a substantially younger, less qualified, and less experienced individual to serve as its interim Director of Information Services. Prior to Plaintiff's termination, that employee reported to Plaintiff.
- 32. In or about December 2016, Defendant hired an individual approximately twenty-four (24) years younger than Plaintiff to permanently replace Plaintiff as its Director of Information Services.
- 33. At the time of Plaintiff's termination, Plaintiff was one of the oldest employees who reported to Bradford-Grey.
- 34. Defendant's stated reason for terminating Plaintiff's employment was a pretext for discrimination.
- 35. Defendant treated other substantially younger employees more favorably than it treated Plaintiff.
- 36. Plaintiff's age was a motivating and/or determinative factor in Defendant's treatment of him, including the decision to terminate his employment.
- 37. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant's behavior, Plaintiff has sustained in the past and will sustain in the future a loss of earning, emotional upset, and pain and suffering.
- 38. Plaintiff is now suffering and will continue to suffer irreparable injury and monetary damages as a result of the unlawful behavior complained of herein unless and until this Court grants the relief requested herein.
 - 39. The conduct of Defendant, as set forth above, was willful under the

circumstances and warrants the imposition of liquidated damages.

COUNT I - ADEA

- 40. Plaintiff incorporates herein by reference paragraphs 1 through 39 above, as if set forth herein in their entirety.
- 41. By committing the foregoing acts of discrimination against Plaintiff, Defendant has violated the ADEA.
- 42. Said violations were willful and warrant the imposition of liquidated damages.
- 43. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant's violation of the ADEA, Plaintiff has suffered the damages and losses set forth herein and has incurred attorney's fees and costs.
- 44. Plaintiff is now suffering and will continue to suffer irreparable injury and monetary damages as a result of Defendant's discriminatory acts unless and until this Court grants the relief requested herein.
 - 45. No previous application has been made for the relief requested herein.

COUNT II - PHRA

- 46. Plaintiff incorporates herein by reference paragraphs 1 through 45 above, as if set forth herein in their entirety.
- 47. Defendant, by the above improper and discriminatory acts, has violated the PHRA.
 - 48. Said violations were intentional and willful.

- 49. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant's violation of the PHRA, Plaintiff has sustained the injuries, damages, and losses set forth herein and has incurred attorney's fees and costs.
- 50. Plaintiff is now suffering and will continue to suffer irreparable injuries and monetary damages as a result of Defendant's discriminatory acts unless and until the Court grants the relief requested herein.
 - 51. No previous application has been made for the relief requested herein.

COUNT III - PFPO

- 52. Plaintiff incorporates herein by reference paragraphs 1 through 51 above, as if set forth herein in their entirety.
- 53. By committing the foregoing acts of discrimination against Plaintiff, Defendant has violated the PFPO.
- 54. Defendant acted willfully and intentionally, and with malice and/or reckless indifference to Plaintiff's rights, thereby warranting the imposition of punitive damages.
- 55. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant's violation of the PFPO, Plaintiff has sustained the injuries, damages and losses set forth herein and has incurred attorneys' fees and costs.
 - 56. No previous application has been made for the relief requested herein.

RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff seeks damages and legal and equitable relief in connection with Defendant's improper conduct, and specifically prays that the Court grant the following relief to the Plaintiff by:

- (a) declaring the acts and practices complained of herein to be in violation of the ADEA;
- (b) declaring the acts and practices complained of herein to be in violation of the PHRA;
- (c) declaring the acts and practices complained of herein to be in violation of the PFPO;
 - (d) enjoining and permanently restraining the violations alleged herein;
- (e) entering judgment against the Defendant and in favor of the Plaintiff in an amount to be determined;
- (f) awarding compensatory damages to make the Plaintiff whole for all lost earnings, earning capacity and benefits, past and future, which Plaintiff has suffered or may suffer as a result of Defendants' improper conduct;
- (g) awarding compensatory damages to Plaintiff for past and future pain and suffering, emotional upset, mental anguish, humiliation, and loss of life's pleasures, which Plaintiff has suffered or may suffer as a result of Defendant's improper conduct;
 - (h) awarding liquidated damages to Plaintiff under the ADEA;
 - (i) awarding punitive damages to Plaintiff under the PFPO;
- (j) awarding Plaintiff such other damages as are appropriate under the ADEA, the PHRA, and the PFPO;
- (k) awarding Plaintiff the costs of suit, expert fees and other disbursements, and reasonable attorneys' fees; and,

(I) granting such other and further relief as this Court may deem just, proper, or equitable including other equitable and injunctive relief providing restitution for past violations and preventing future violations.

JURY DEMAND

Plaintiff demands a trial by jury.

CONSOLE MATTIACCI LAW, LLC

Dated: December 29, 2017 BY:

Stephen G. Console, Esquire

Brian Farrell, Esquire 1525 Locust St., 9th Floor Philadelphia, PA 19102

(215) 545-7676

(215) 545-8211 (fax)

Attorneys for Plaintiff, Russell Troyer

Exhibit "1"

<u> </u>		······································	-, ,			
CHARGE OF DISCRIMINATION			1	GENCY	CHARGE NUMBER	
This form is affected by the Privacy Act of 1974; See privacy statement consolidating this form.				FEPA EEOC	530-2016-04250	
STATE OR LOCAL AGENCY: Pennsylvania Human Relations Con Philadelphia Commission on Human Relations			High que que a como			
NAME (Indicate Mr., Ms., Mrs.) Russell Troyer		HOME TE	HOME TELEPHONE NUMBER (Include Area Code)			
STREET ADDRESS CITY, STATE AND ZIP Philadelphia, PA 19130			•		DATE OF BIRTH 20	
NAMED IS THE EMPLOYER, LABOR OF STATE OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT WHO	RGANIZATION, DISCRIMINATED	EMPLOYMI AGAINST N	ENT A IE (If i	GENCY,	APPRENTICESEIP, OM STITEE, one than list below) بن	
NAME Defender Association of Philadelphia	NUMBER OF EN	MPLOYEES,	МЕМІ	BERS	TELEPHONE (Include Area Code) (215) 568-3190	
STREET ADDRESS CITY, STATE AND Z 1441 Sansom Street Philadelphia, PA 1910					COUNTY Philadelphia	
CAUSE OF DISCRIMINATION (Check appropriate box(es)) Q Race Q Color Q Sex Q Religion Q National Origin Q Retaliation X Age Q Disability Q Other (Specify)			DATE DISCRIMINATION TOOK PLACE Earliest Latest 04/11/2016			
The Particulars Are:			· ····································			
A. 1. Relevant Work History	nril 1 1006 as th	o Director of	Inform	notion Co		
I was hired by Respondent on or around April 1, 1996 as the Director of Information Services. I worked as Respondent's Director of Information Services until Respondent terminated my employment. I had reported to Ellen Greenlee (75 years of age ^a), Chief Defender, until March 2015, when she retired. Greenlee was then replaced by Keir Bradford-Grey (48 years of age). From September 2015 until Respondent terminated my employment, I reported to Chief Defender Bradford-Grey.						
Respondent terminated my employment on April 11, 2016. I was sixty-six (66) years of age at that time, and had over twenty (20) years of service at Respondent. I had no warning that I would be terminated.						
I consistently demonstrated excellent performance and dedication to Respondent. By way of example, in or around 2013, I received a \$10,000 merit increase. This was an extraordinary increase for Respondent. This increase was accompanied with very sincere thanks and appreciation for the job I was doing in automating the operations and generally running IT at Respondent.						
X I want this charge filed with both the EEOC and the State or local Agency, if any. I will advise the agencies if I change my address or telephone number			NOTARY - (when necessary for State and Local Requirements)			
and cooperate fully with them in the processing of my charge in accordance with their procedures		lance I swear	I swear of affirm that I have read the above charge and that it is true to the best of my knowledge information and belief.			
I declare under penalty or perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.						
9/23/16 Kunsup. Try			SIGNATURE OF COMPLAINANT SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN TO BEFORE ME THIS DATE			
(Day Mo			ind yea	r)		

^a All ages herein are approximations.

2. Harm Summary

I have been discriminated against because of my age (66). Evidence of the discriminatory conduct to which I have been subjected includes, but is not limited to, the followings 255

- (a) Since approximately 2014 until Respondent terminated my employment, I had been training Respondent's Application Specialist in the IT Department, Manoj Hillpshi o (who is in his mid-40s).
- . o (b) I never had a performance review or any written assessment or evaluation of my performance in the over twenty (20) years of service to Respondent.
- (c) The closest Respondent ever came to giving me a performance review is when. several times a year, the former First Assistant Defender, Charlie Cunningham. would stop by my office, close the door, look me in the eye, and tell me how much he appreciated what I was doing and how Respondent could not be where it was without me.
- (d) The former First Assistant Defender Cunningham was replaced by James McHugh (48 years of age) in October 2015.
- (e) In or about the week before Bradford-Grey began as my supervisor and the Chief Defender in September 2015, I provided her with a 40-page IT report, detailing Respondent's IT landscape, to provide her with information about the Department.
- (f) After giving her the IT report, Bradford-Grey never responded to me about the report or discussed the report with me, absent a passing comment to me a month later that she had finally read the report and starred many things in it that she liked.
- (g) As my supervisor and the Chief Defender, Bradford-Grey never met with me one-onone to discuss the IT Department.
- (h) In any meetings I had with Bradford-Grey, she always had her consultant, Susan Levy (48 years of age), or First Assistant Defender McHugh with her. I had difficulty setting up any meetings I requested with Bradford-Grey, and she would hijack the few meetings where I was present.
- (i) Bradford-Grey never made any effort to engage me in conversation.
- (i) Bradford-Grey never responded to emails I addressed and sent to her, or answered questions I directed to her that required her response.
- (k) The only phone call I ever received from Bradford-Grey was when she informed me that she had retained a consultant to review the IT Department.
- (I) Bradford-Grey made vague comments that there were problems with the IT Department, but never provided details or met with me to discuss concerns she had.
- (m) in a debriefing meeting about the IT consultant's report, Bradford-Grey stated that the IT Department operation was functioning like it was back in 2001.
- (n) In or around the end of March 2016, a few weeks before I was terminated, Bradford-Grey announced that Respondent was creating a new position—Human Resources Chief Operating Officer-and announced that her consultant, Susan Levy, would be filling the position.

EEOC Charge of Discrimination Page 3 of 3 Initials of Charging Party –

(o) On April 11, 2016, I was called into a meeting with Chief Defender Bradford-Green First Assistant Defender McHugh, and Human Resources Director Dana-Roberts We met in Bradford-Grey's office.

ָטַכ

- (p) At the April 11 meeting, Bradford-Grey stated that Respondent did a thorough review of the IT Department, and that, because of a change in direction, they not longer needed my services.
- (q) Bradford-Grey was the only person who spoke at the April 11 meeting.
- (r) I was terminated at that meeting, effective immediately.
- (s) I was stunned. I had no advance warning or notice that Respondent was going to terminate my employment, after my more than twenty (20) years of service to Respondent.
- (t) I initially received nothing in writing when I was terminated. During the meeting, it became clear to me that nothing in writing was going to be provided to me. Because I requested something in writing, Bradford-Grey gave me her talking points from the meeting.
- (u) The stated reason for my termination was that a change in leadership was necessary.
- (v) Udeshi, who I had been training, has replaced me as the Interim Director of Information Services as Respondent searches for my permanent replacement.
- (w) Respondent has produced a job posting to find my replacement as Director of Information Services.
- (x) I qualify for Respondent's posted Director of Information Services position, and would be able to perform all of the functions required. There is nothing in the posting that I did not do as Director of Information Services or would be unable to do if asked.
- (y) Upon information and belief, Respondent has a pattern and practice of shunning and displacing older workers.

B. 1. Respondents' Stated Reasons

(a) Respondent's stated reason for my termination, that a change in leadership was necessary, is pretext for age discrimination.

C. 1. Statutes and Bases for Allegations

I believe that Respondent has discriminated against me based on my age (66) in violation of the Age Discrimination in Employment Act, as amended, 29 U.S.C. § 623 et seq. ("ADEA"); the Pennsylvania Human Relations Act, as amended, 43 P.S. § 951, et seq. ("PHRA"); and the Philadelphia Fair Practices Ordinance, as amended, Phila. Code § 9-1100, et seq. ("PFPO") as set forth herein.

INFORMATION FOR COMPLAINANTS & ELECTION OPTION TO DUAL FILE WITH THE PENNSYLVANIA HUMAN RELATIONS COMMISSION

Russell Troyer v. Defender Association of Philadelphia

EEOC No. 530-2016 - 04250	35	ب
You have the right to file this charge of discrimination with the Pennsylvania Human Commission (PHRC) under the Pennsylvania Human Relations Act. Filing your charge PHRC protects your state rights, especially since there may be circumstances in which and federal laws and procedures vary in a manner which would affect the outcome of case.	Relati ge with ch state	ons
Complaints filed with the PHRC must be filed within 180 days of the act(s) which yo are unlawful discrimination. If PHRC determines that your PHRC complaint is until will be dismissed.	u belie mely, it	ve
If you want your charge filed with the PHRC, including this form as part of your EEC with your signature under the verification below, will constitute filing with the PHRC have chosen EEOC to investigate your complaint, so PHRC will not investigate it an cases, will accept EEOC's finding. If you disagree with PHRC's adoption of EEOC you will have the chance to file a request for preliminary hearing with PHRC.	C. You d, in m	ıost
Since you have chosen to file your charge first with EEOC, making it the primary invagency, the Respondent will not be required to file an answer with PHRC, and no oth with PHRC is required by either party, unless/until otherwise notified by PHRC.	estigat ier acti	ory on
If your case is still pending with PHRC after one year from filing with PHRC, you ha right to file your complaint in state court. PHRC will inform you of these rights and obligations at that time. [Sign and date appropriate request below]	ve the	
X I want my charge filed with PHRC. I hereby incorporate this form and the verific below into the attached EEOC complaint form and file it as my PHRC complaint. I rec EEOC to transmit it to PHRC.	ation quest	

I do not want my charge dual filed with PHRC

18

Pa.C.S. §4904, relating to unsworn falsification to authorities.

X

Signature and Date

I understand that false statements in this complaint are made subject to the penalties of

Exhibit "2"

EEOC Form 161-B (11/16)

U.S. EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION

NOTICE OF RIGHT TO SUF (ISSUED ON REQUEST)

	NOTICE	F RIGHT TO SUE (750	JULD O	VILQUEUI/	
	Il Troyer elphia, PA 19130		From:	Philadelphia District Office 801 Market Street Sulte 1300 Philadelphia, PA 19107	
				•	
	On behalf of person(s) aggrieved who CONFIDENTIAL (29 CFR §1601.7(a))				
EEOC Charge	No.	EEOC Representative	•	Telepho	one No.
		Legal Unit,		(045)	440 2020
530-2016-0)4250	Legal Technician			440-2828
Naman wa mu	E PERSON AGGRIEVED:		(See also	the additional information enclos	sea with this form.)
W2141 - 3 411 - # 41-	- Civil Dimber Act of 1964 the Ar	nericans with Disabilities A	ct (ADA)	, or the Genetic Information No	ndiscrimination
Act (GINA): been issued of your rece	This is your Notice of Right to Sue, at your request. Your lawsuit under ipt of this notice; or your right to so be different.)	issued under little VII, the AL r Title VIII, the ADA or GINA n	JA OF GIN. nust be fi	A pased on the above-humbered led in a federal or state court V	VITHIN 90 DAYS
	More than 180 days have passed				
	Less than 180 days have passed be able to complete its administra	since the filing of this charge itive processing within 180 da	, but I hav ays from th	e determined that it is unlikely that ne filing of this charge.	at the EEOC will
	The EEOC is terminating its proce	essing of this charge.			
	The EEOC will continue to proces				
Age Discrim 90 days after your case:	ination in Employment Act (ADE ryou receive notice that we have co	ompleted action on the charg	e. III uus	regard, the paragraph marked k	olon applies to
X	The EEOC is closing your case. 90 DAYS of your receipt of this	Therefore, your lawsuit under Notice. Otherwise, your right	r the ADE, nt to sue b	A must be filed in federal or sta pased on the above-numbered ch	ate court <u>WITHIN</u> arge will be lost.
	The EEOC is continuing its handl you may file suit in federal or stat	e court under the ADEA at th	is time.		
in fadaral ar	ct (EPA): You already have the rig state court within 2 years (3 years fo ns that occurred <u>more than 2 yea</u>	ir willful violations) of the alleg	eu era ui	idelbayment. This modus that be	ts must be brought ackpay due for
If you file sui	t, based on this charge, please send	l a copy of your court complain	nt to this o	ffice.	
		On behalf	of the Co	mmission	. 1
		K	SB	/0	0/2/17
Enclosures	(s)	Kevin J. Acting Distri		,	(Date Mailed)
	DEFENDER ASSOCIATION OF PI Emily R. Derstine Friesen (for Re COZEN O'CONNOR	HILADELPHIA spondent)	CONS	nen G. Console SOLE LAW OFFICE Locust Street	

1650 Market St., Suite 2800 Philadelphia, PA 19103

Philadelphia, PA 19102